

Asymptotic expansions of several series and their application

Viktor P. Zastavnyi

Version published in Ukrainian Mathematical Bulletin, vol. 6(2009), № 4

Abstract. Asymptotic expansions of series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^k (k+a)^\gamma e^{-(k+a)^\alpha x}$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon^k (k+a)^\gamma}{(x(k+a)^\alpha + 1)^\mu}$ in powers of x as $x \rightarrow +0$ are found, where $\varepsilon = 1$ or $\varepsilon = -1$. These expansions are applied to obtain precise inequalities for Mathieu series.

MSC 2000. 34E05, 26D15.

Key words. Asymptotic expansion, residues, generalized Mathieu series, inequalities.

1 Introduction and formulation of main results

One of the purposes of this paper is to investigate functional series of the form

$$f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+a)^\gamma e^{-(k+a)^\alpha x}, \quad x > 0, \quad (1.1)$$

$$\tilde{f}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k (k+a)^\gamma e^{-(k+a)^\alpha x}, \quad x > 0, \quad (1.2)$$

with parameters $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha > 0$. Series (1.1) and (1.2) appear in many problems of the analysis. In particular, for $x = \ln \frac{1}{\rho}$, $a = \frac{1}{2}$, $\alpha = 1$, $\gamma = -r - 1$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ series (1.1) and (1.2) appeared in the paper due to A. F. Timan [1] in 1950. He proved that these series give an exact value of the remainder when periodic differentiable functions are approximated by Poisson integrals. Finding a complete asymptotic representation was the aim of the papers due to L. V. Malei [2], É. L. Shtark [3], V. A. Baskakov [4], and K. M. Zhigallo and Yu. I. Kharkevich [5]. A complete solution to this problem was obtained in the author's paper [6], where expansions in series in powers of x were found in the explicit form

for the functions (1.1) and (1.2) with $a > 0$, $\alpha = 1$, $\gamma = -r - 1$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ if $0 < x < 2\pi$ and $0 < x < \pi$ respectively.

Applying the residue theory, Gel'fond [7, §4.3] in 1966 found an asymptotic expansion in powers of x^k , $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ as $x \rightarrow +0$ for the function (1.1) with $a = 1$, $-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} \notin \mathbb{Z}_+$. Here $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ stands for the set of all nonnegative integers. In the case $a = 1$, $-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ he pointed out only that the sum in an asymptotic expansion *has to be changed in an appropriate way*. In [7, §4.3], it was also claimed that for $a = 1$ an asymptotic expansion of the function (1.2) in powers of x^k , $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ as $x \rightarrow +0$ can be obtained similarly. In 2008, using the Euler–Maclaurin formula it was found by the author [8] the asymptotic expansion of the functions (1.1) and (1.2) as $x \rightarrow +0$ for any $a > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ (note that, in examples on pp. 56–57 of [8], the term $(-1)^{\alpha k + \gamma}$ is missing under the sum sign in the right-hand side of asymptotic expansions).

In theorems 1.1 and 1.2 here the asymptotic expansions of the functions (1.1) and (1.2) as $x \rightarrow +0$ are given for all admissible parameters. Coefficients of these expansions are expressed by the Hurwitz function $\zeta(s, a)$ and the function $\tilde{\zeta}(s, a)$ respectively. The last ones are defined by formulas

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta(s, a) &:= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k+a)^s}, \quad \operatorname{Re} s > 1; \\ \tilde{\zeta}(s, a) &:= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(k+a)^s}, \quad \operatorname{Re} s > 0,\end{aligned}\tag{1.3}$$

for a fixed $a > 0$.

Using the Hermite formula one can continue the Hurwitz function analytically to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{1\}$. Moreover, the point $s = 1$ stands for its first-order pole, and for $a > 0$ the following relations hold (see [9, 10]):

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \left(\zeta(s, a) - \frac{1}{s-1} \right) &= -\frac{\Gamma'(a)}{\Gamma(a)}, \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \left(\zeta(s, a) - 2^{1-s} \zeta \left(s, \frac{a+1}{2} \right) \right) &= -\frac{\Gamma'(a)}{\Gamma(a)} + \frac{\Gamma' \left(\frac{a+1}{2} \right)}{\Gamma \left(\frac{a+1}{2} \right)} + \ln 2.\end{aligned}\tag{1.4}$$

Here $\Gamma(s) = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-t} t^{s-1} dt$, $\operatorname{Re} s > 0$ is referred to as the Euler gamma-function. The relation

$$\tilde{\zeta}(s, a) = \zeta(s, a) - 2^{1-s} \zeta \left(s, \frac{a+1}{2} \right), \quad \operatorname{Re} s > 1,\tag{1.5}$$

implies that the function $\tilde{\zeta}(s, a)$ is analytically continued to $\mathbb{C}$, and

$$\tilde{\zeta}(1, a) = -\frac{\Gamma'(a)}{\Gamma(a)} + \frac{\Gamma'(\frac{a+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{a+1}{2})} + \ln 2, \quad a > 0. \quad (1.6)$$

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\alpha > 0$. Then the following asymptotic expansions hold:*

$$f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) \underset{x \rightarrow +0}{\sim} \frac{1}{\alpha} \Gamma\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right) x^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \zeta(-\alpha k - \gamma, a) x^k, \quad (1.7)$$

$$f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) \underset{x \rightarrow +0}{\sim} \frac{(-1)^r x^r}{\Gamma(r+1)} \left(-\frac{\ln x}{\alpha} + \frac{\Gamma'(r+1)}{\Gamma(r+1)} \frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{\Gamma'(a)}{\Gamma(a)} \right) + \sum_{k=0, k \neq r}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \zeta(-\alpha k - \gamma, a) x^k, \quad (1.8)$$

if $-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} \notin \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} = r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ respectively. If $0 < \alpha < 1$, then (1.7) and (1.8) turn into equalities whenever $x > 0$. If $\alpha = 1$, then (1.7) and (1.8) are equalities whenever $x \in (0, 2\pi)$.

The fact that the relations (1.7) are equalities for all $x > 0$ if $a = 1$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, was mentioned without proof in [7].

Theorem 1.2. *Let $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $\alpha > 0$. Then the following asymptotic expansion holds:*

$$\tilde{f}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) \underset{x \rightarrow +0}{\sim} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \tilde{\zeta}(-\alpha k - \gamma, a) x^k. \quad (1.9)$$

If $0 < \alpha < 1$, then the (1.9) turns into an equality for all $x > 0$. If $\alpha = 1$, then (1.9) is an equality for all $x \in (0, \pi)$.

In what follows we will consider the functional series of the form

$$g(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(k+a)^\gamma}{(x(k+a)^\alpha + 1)^\mu}, \quad \mu > \max\left\{\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}; 0\right\}, \quad x > 0, \quad (1.10)$$

$$\tilde{g}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k (k+a)^\gamma}{(x(k+a)^\alpha + 1)^\mu}, \quad \mu > \max\left\{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}; 0\right\}, \quad x > 0, \quad (1.11)$$

with parameters $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$ and $\mu > 0$.

Theorem 1.3. Suppose that $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$ and $\mu > \max \left\{ \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}; 0 \right\}$. Then the following asymptotic expansions hold:

$$g(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) \underset{x \rightarrow +0}{\sim} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right) \Gamma\left(\mu - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right)}{\alpha \Gamma(\mu)} x^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \frac{\Gamma(\mu+k)}{\Gamma(\mu)} \zeta(-\alpha k - \gamma, a) x^k, \quad (1.12)$$

$$g(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) \underset{x \rightarrow +0}{\sim} \frac{\Gamma(\mu+r)(-1)^r x^r}{\Gamma(\mu)\Gamma(r+1)} \left(-\frac{\ln x}{\alpha} + \frac{\Gamma'(r+1)}{\alpha \Gamma(r+1)} - \frac{\Gamma'(a)}{\Gamma(a)} - \frac{\Gamma'(\mu+r)}{\alpha \Gamma(\mu+r)} \right) + \sum_{k=0, k \neq r}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \frac{\Gamma(\mu+k)}{\Gamma(\mu)} \zeta(-\alpha k - \gamma, a) x^k, \quad (1.13)$$

for $-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} \notin \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} = r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ respectively.

Theorem 1.4. Let $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$, and let $\mu > \max \left\{ \frac{\gamma}{\alpha}; 0 \right\}$. Then the following asymptotic expansion holds:

$$\tilde{g}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) \underset{x \rightarrow +0}{\sim} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \frac{\Gamma(\mu+k)}{\Gamma(\mu)} \tilde{\zeta}(-\alpha k - \gamma, a) x^k. \quad (1.14)$$

Note that Theorems 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 are proved by using the technique of [7]. In § 2 these theorems are applied to obtain precise inequalities for Mathieu series.

2 Precise inequalities for Mathieu series

Consider the following functional series with parameters $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$ and $\mu > 0$:

$$S(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(k+a)^\gamma}{((k+a)^\alpha + x)^\mu}, \quad \mu > \max \left\{ \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}; 0 \right\}, \quad x \geq 0, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\tilde{S}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k (k+a)^\gamma}{((k+a)^\alpha + x)^\mu}, \quad \mu > \max \left\{ \frac{\gamma}{\alpha}; 0 \right\}, \quad x \geq 0. \quad (2.2)$$

As is customary in recent years, (2.1) and (2.2) are said to be a generalized Mathieu series and a generalized alternating Mathieu series respectively. In 1890, Émile Leonard Mathieu [13] introduced the hypothesis on the validity of the following inequality:

$$S(x, 1, 1, 2, 2) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{k+1}{((k+1)^2 + x)^2} < \frac{1}{2x}, x > 0. \quad (2.3)$$

Different proofs of the inequality (2.3) were published in the papers due to Berg [14], van der Corput, Heflinger [15] and Makai [16] in 1952–1957. In the Makai's paper [16] there were proved the inequalities

$$\frac{1}{2(q+x)} < \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{k+1}{((k+1)^2 + x)^2} < \frac{1}{2(p+x)}, x > 0, \quad (2.4)$$

where $q = \frac{1}{2}$ and $p = 0$. Thus, the following natural problem arises: to find a maximal possible p and a minimal possible q satisfying the inequality (2.4). In 1982, Elbert [17] conjectured that one can take $q = \frac{1}{2\zeta(3)}$ in (2.4), where $\zeta(s)$ stands for the Riemann zeta-function. In 1998, Alzer, Brenner and Ruehr [18] proved that $q = \frac{1}{2\zeta(3)}$ and $p = \frac{1}{6}$ are sharp constants in the inequality (2.4).

In 2008, it was proved by the author [19] that for any $\mu > 1$ and $a \geq 1$ there exist positive constants $m(\mu, a)$ and $M(\mu, a)$ such that the inequality

$$\frac{1}{2(\mu-1)(q+x)^{\mu-1}} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(k+a)}{((k+a)^2 + x)^{\mu}} \leq \frac{1}{2(\mu-1)(p+x)^{\mu-1}} \quad (2.5)$$

is fulfilled for every $x > 0$ if and only if $0 \leq p \leq m(\mu, a)$ and $q \geq M(\mu, a)$. In this case, for any fixed $a \geq 1$ the functions $m(\mu, a)$ and $M(\mu, a)$ decrease and increase respectively on $\mu \in (1, +\infty)$, and for all $a \geq 1$, $\mu > 1$ the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} a^2 - a < m(\infty, a) \leq m(\mu, a) \leq a^2 - a + \frac{1}{6} \\ a^2 - a + \frac{1}{4} < M(\mu, a) < M(\infty, a) = a^2. \end{aligned}$$

It was also proved that $m(\mu, 1) = \frac{1}{6}$, $\mu \in (1, 3]$. Thus, if $a \geq 1$ then inequality (2.5) is valid for all $\mu > 1$ if and only if $0 \leq p \leq m(\infty, a)$ and $q \geq M(\infty, a) = a^2$. The right-hand side inequality in (2.5) was proved for $a = 1$, $p = 0$ and $\mu > 1$ by Diananda [20] in 1980. A big list related to this matter can be found in [21].

If $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$ and $\mu > \max \left\{ \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}; 0 \right\}$, then by Theorem 1.3 we have

$$S(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \begin{cases} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha})}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\mu - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha})}{\Gamma(\mu)} \cdot x^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} - \mu} & , \quad \gamma + 1 > 0 , \\ \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot x^{-\mu} \ln x & , \quad \gamma + 1 = 0 , \\ \zeta(-\gamma, a) x^{-\mu} & , \quad \gamma + 1 < 0 . \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

Hence the following problem is natural. Assume that $a > 0$, $\gamma + 1 > 0$, $\alpha > 0$ and $\mu_0 \geq \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$. For which $q \geq 0$, $p \geq 0$, $A \in \mathbb{R}$ and $B > 0$ the inequality

$$\frac{B \cdot \Gamma\left(\mu - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right)}{\Gamma(\mu)(q+x)^{\mu - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}}} \leq S(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) \leq \frac{A \cdot \Gamma\left(\mu - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right)}{\Gamma(\mu)(p+x)^{\mu - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}}} \quad (2.7)$$

holds for any $\mu > \mu_0$ and $x > 0$? This problem is completely solved in Theorem 2.1, and an analogous problem is solved in Theorem 2.2 in the case of $\gamma + 1 < 0$.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that $a > 0$, $\gamma + 1 > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, $\mu_0 \geq \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$, $q \geq 0$, $p \geq 0$, $A \in \mathbb{R}$ and $B > 0$. Then the inequality (2.7) is valid for all $\mu > \mu_0$ and $x > 0$ if and only if $0 \leq p < a^\alpha \leq q$, $A \geq A_p(a, \gamma, \alpha)$, $0 < B \leq B_q(a, \gamma, \alpha)$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} A_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) &:= \sup_{x>0} e^{p x} x^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) , \\ B_q(a, \gamma, \alpha) &:= \inf_{x>0} e^{q x} x^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) . \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

In this case, the inequality (2.7) is strict for all $x > 0$. If $p > 0$, it is also strict at $x = 0$. Moreover, $A_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) < +\infty$ if and only if $p < a^\alpha$, and $B_q(a, \gamma, \alpha) > 0$ if and only if $q \geq a^\alpha$. If $a \geq 1$ then $A_p(a, 1, 2) = B_q(a, 1, 2) = \frac{1}{2}$ for all $q \geq a^2$ and $0 \leq p \leq m(\infty, a)$; in particular, this is valid for all $p \in [0, a^2 - a]$.

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that $a > 0$, $\gamma + 1 < 0$, $\alpha > 0$, $\mu_0 \geq 0$, $q \geq 0$, $p \geq 0$, $D \in \mathbb{R}$ and $E > 0$. Then the inequality*

$$\frac{E}{(q+x)^\mu} \leq S(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) \leq \frac{D}{(p+x)^\mu} \quad (2.9)$$

holds for every $\mu > \mu_0$ and $x > 0$ if and only if $0 \leq p \leq a^\alpha \leq q$, $D \geq D_p(a, \gamma, \alpha)$, $0 < E \leq E_q(a, \gamma, \alpha)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} D_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) &:= \sup_{x>0} e^{p x} f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) , \\ E_q(a, \gamma, \alpha) &:= \inf_{x>0} e^{q x} f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) . \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

In this case, inequality (2.9) is strict for all $x > 0$. If $p > 0$, it is also strict at $x = 0$. Moreover, $D_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) < +\infty$ if and only if $p \leq a^\alpha$, and $E_q(a, \gamma, \alpha) > 0$ if and only if $q \geq a^\alpha$. Besides, $D_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) = \zeta(-\gamma, a)$ for all $p \leq a^\alpha$ and $E_q(a, \gamma, \alpha) = a^\gamma$ at $q = a^\alpha$.

If $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$ and $\mu > \max\{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}; 0\}$, then Theorem 1.4 yields that

$$\tilde{S}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) = x^{-\mu} \left(\tilde{\zeta}(-\gamma, a) + o(1) \right), \quad x \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (2.11)$$

Therefore the following problem is natural for series (2.2). Let $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$, and let $\mu_0 \geq \max\{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}; 0\}$. For which $q \geq 0$, $p \geq 0$ and $C, F \in \mathbb{R}$ the inequality

$$\frac{F}{(q+x)^\mu} \leq \tilde{S}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) \leq \frac{C}{(p+x)^\mu} \quad (2.12)$$

holds for any $\mu > \mu_0$ and $x > 0$? In the paper due to Tomovski and Hilfer [22], it is claimed that this is satisfied in the case $a = 1$, $\gamma > 0$ if we take $p = C = 1$ and $\mu_0 = \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$ in the right-hand side of the (2.12). A mistake in the proof of this Tomovski and Hilfer's assertion was indicated by the author in [23]. In the same paper [23], it was proved that for $m, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma = 4m + 5$, $\alpha\mu - \gamma > 0$ the right-hand side inequality of the (2.12) with $a = p = C = 1$ is impossible for large $x > 0$. Theorem 2.3 presents all the solutions to this problem.

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$, $\mu_0 \geq \max\{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}; 0\}$, $q \geq 0$, $p \geq 0$ and $C, F \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the inequality (2.12) is satisfied for every $\mu > \mu_0$ and $x > 0$ if and only if $0 \leq p \leq a^\alpha$, $C \geq C_p(a, \gamma, \alpha)$, $F \leq F_q(a, \gamma, \alpha)$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} C_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) &:= \sup_{x>0} e^{px} \tilde{f}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha), \\ F_q(a, \gamma, \alpha) &:= \inf_{x>0} e^{qx} \tilde{f}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

In this case, the inequality (2.12) is strict for $x > 0$. If $q, p > 0$, it is also strict at $x = 0$. Moreover, we have $0 < C_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) < +\infty$ for $p \leq a^\alpha$ and $C_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) = +\infty$ for $p > a^\alpha$.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Euler gamma-function

The function $\Gamma(s)$ is analytically continued to the whole plane $\mathbb{C}$ except to the points $s = -k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ in which it has simple poles. Moreover,

the following relations

$$\Gamma(s+1) = s\Gamma(s) \quad , \quad \Gamma(s)\Gamma(1-s) = \frac{\pi}{\sin \pi s} \quad (3.1)$$

hold for all admissible $s \in \mathbb{C}$. If $s = \sigma + it = |s|e^{i\varphi}$, where $\sigma, t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi = \varphi(s) = \arg s \in (-\pi, \pi)$, we have

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \Gamma(s+1) &= \sqrt{2\pi} s^{s+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-s} e^{R(s)} \quad , \quad |R(s)| \leq \frac{1}{12|s| \cos^2 \frac{\varphi}{2}} \quad , \\ |s^{s+\frac{1}{2}}| &= |s|^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\varphi(s)t} = |s|^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-|\varphi(s)||t|} \quad , \\ |\Gamma(s+1)| &= \sqrt{2\pi} |s|^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\sigma} e^{-|\varphi(s)||t|} |e^{R(s)}| \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.2)$$

(see [11, §1.5.1]). If, in addition, $\operatorname{Re} s = \sigma > 0$, then $|\varphi(s)| = \operatorname{arctg} \frac{|t|}{\sigma}$, and hence

$$\left. \begin{aligned} |\Gamma(s+1)| &= \sqrt{2\pi} |s|^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\sigma} e^{-|t| \operatorname{arctg} \frac{|t|}{\sigma}} |e^{R(s)}| \quad , \quad |R(s)| \leq \frac{1}{6|s|} \quad , \\ |\Gamma(s+1)| &\leq \sqrt{2\pi} |s|^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}|t|} e^{\frac{1}{6|s|}} \quad , \\ \frac{1}{|\Gamma(s+1)|} &\leq (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |s|^{-\sigma-\frac{1}{2}} e^{\sigma} e^{|t| \operatorname{arctg} \frac{|t|}{\sigma}} e^{\frac{1}{6|s|}} \quad . \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.3)$$

Here we take the inequalities $|e^w| \leq e^{|w|}$, $w \in \mathbb{C}$ and $0 < \frac{\pi}{2} - \operatorname{arctg} u < \frac{1}{u}$, $u > 0$ into account.

Let $0 < \delta \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$, $|\arg s| \leq \pi - \delta$, and let $\operatorname{Re} s = \sigma$. Considering the cases $\sigma > 0$ and $\sigma \leq 0$ (here $|\arg s| \geq \frac{\pi}{2}$) separately we derive from (3.2) that

$$|\Gamma(s+1)| \leq \sqrt{2\pi} |s|^{\sigma+\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{|\sigma|-\sigma}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}|t|} e^{\frac{1}{12|s| \sin^2 \frac{\delta}{2}}} \quad , \quad |\arg s| \leq \pi - \delta \quad . \quad (3.4)$$

3.2 Hurwitz function

If the case of $a = p + a_0$, where $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < a_0 \leq 1$, we have

$$\zeta(s, a) = \zeta(s, a_0) - \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \frac{1}{(k+a_0)^s} \quad , \quad s \neq 1 \quad . \quad (3.5)$$

The relation (3.5) is obvious whenever $\operatorname{Re} s > 1$, and for the remaining $s \neq 1$ it is implied by the uniqueness theorem for analytic functions. The following formula is due to Hurwitz:

$$\zeta(s, a) = \frac{2\Gamma(1-s)}{(2\pi)^{1-s}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sin(2\pi ak + \frac{\pi}{2}s)}{k^{1-s}} \quad , \quad \operatorname{Re} s < 0 \quad , \quad 0 < a \leq 1 \quad . \quad (3.6)$$

If $0 < a \leq 1$ then it follows from [9, §13.51] the existence of positive constants $c(a) > 0$ and $t(a) > 1$ such that the inequality

$$|\zeta(\sigma + it, a)| \leq c(a)|t|^{\tau(\sigma)} \ln |t|, \quad |t| \geq t(a), \quad \text{where} \quad \tau(\sigma) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} - \sigma & , \quad \sigma \leq 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} & , \quad 0 \leq \sigma \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ 1 - \sigma & , \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1, \\ 0 & , \quad \sigma \geq 1 \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

is fulfilled for $\sigma, t \in \mathbb{R}$.

3.3 Mellin transform

If $x^{\sigma-1}f(x) \in L(0, +\infty)$ for some $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, then the Mellin transform of a function f is defined by

$$g(s) = \int_0^{+\infty} x^{s-1} f(x) dx, \quad s = \sigma + it, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

If, in addition, the function f is of bounded variation in a neighborhood of $x > 0$, then the following inversion formula holds:

$$\frac{f(x+0) + f(x-0)}{2} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma-i\infty}^{\sigma+i\infty} g(s) x^{-s} ds$$

(see [12, §1.29]), where the integral is treated in the sense of Cauchy principal value. If we take $f(x) = e^{-x}$ and $f(x) = (x+1)^{-\mu}$, $\mu > 0$, we find $g(s) = \Gamma(s)$, $\text{Re } s > 0$, and $g(s) = \frac{\Gamma(\mu-s)\Gamma(s)}{\Gamma(\mu)}$, $0 < \text{Re } s < \mu$, respectively. Therefore for any $x > 0$ the following two relations are met:

$$e^{-x} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma-i\infty}^{\sigma+i\infty} \Gamma(s) x^{-s} ds, \quad \sigma > 0, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\frac{1}{(x+1)^\mu} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma-i\infty}^{\sigma+i\infty} \frac{\Gamma(\mu-s)\Gamma(s)}{\Gamma(\mu)} x^{-s} ds, \quad 0 < \sigma < \mu. \quad (3.9)$$

4 Proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4

Proof of asymptotic expansions in Theorem 1.1

Take $\sigma = \beta > \max\left\{0, \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right\}$ in (3.8), and replace x by $(k+a)^\alpha x$, $a > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\alpha > 0$, $x > 0$. Then we summarize the obtained inequalities

$$(k+a)^\gamma e^{-(k+a)^\alpha x} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\beta-i\infty}^{\beta+i\infty} \Gamma(s) x^{-s} (k+a)^{-\alpha s + \gamma} ds$$

over all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. In the left-hand side, we obtain $f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha)$. In the right-hand side, we interchange the sum and the integral signs (this is well defined in view of (3.2), (3.3) and $\alpha\beta - \gamma > 1$). We obtain that for any $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$, $x > 0$ and $\beta > \max\left\{0, \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right\}$ the following relation holds:

$$f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\beta-i\infty}^{\beta+i\infty} F(s) ds, \quad F(s) = \Gamma(s) x^{-s} \zeta(\alpha s - \gamma, a). \quad (4.1)$$

The function $F(s)$ is analytic on the whole plane except in the poles $s = -k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $s = \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$. If $-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} \notin \mathbb{Z}_+$ then these poles are different and simple. Take $\sigma_n = n + \frac{1}{2}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and consider the rectangle

$$K_{n,m} := \{s \in \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Im} s| \leq m, -\sigma_n \leq \operatorname{Re} s \leq \beta\}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

If $\sigma_n \neq -\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$ then by the residue theorem we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial K_{n,m}} F(s) ds = \Sigma_n, \quad (4.2)$$

where Σ_n stands for the sum of residues of the function F in poles lying on the interval $(-\sigma_n, \beta)$. If $n > -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then the interval $(-\sigma_n, \beta)$ contains only poles $s = -k$, $k = 0, \dots, n$, and $s = \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$. Both estimates (3.4), (3.7) and relation (3.5) yield (in the case of $a > 1$) that the integrals over horizontal segments $s = \sigma \pm im$, $-\sigma_n \leq \sigma \leq \beta$ tend to zero as $m \rightarrow +\infty$ in the left-hand side of (4.2). Therefore both (4.1) and (4.2) imply the following relation:

$$f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) = \Sigma_n + I_n, \quad I_n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\sigma_n-i\infty}^{-\sigma_n+i\infty} F(s) ds, \quad \sigma_n \neq -\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}. \quad (4.3)$$

First, let us calculate Σ_n . It follows from relation (1.4) that the expansion of the function $\zeta(\alpha s - \gamma, a)$ in a Laurent series in a neighborhood of the pole $s = \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(\alpha s - \gamma, a) &= \frac{c_{-1}}{s - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} + c_0 + c_1 \left(s - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} \right) + \dots, \\ c_{-1} &= \frac{1}{\alpha}, \quad c_0 = -\frac{\Gamma'(a)}{\Gamma(a)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Complement formula (3.1) implies that the expansion of the Γ -function in a Laurent series in a neighborhood of the pole $s = -k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is of

the form

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(s) &= \frac{a_{-1}}{s+k} + a_0 + a_1(s+k) + \dots, \\ a_{-1} &= \frac{(-1)^k}{\Gamma(k+1)}, \quad a_0 = \frac{(-1)^k \Gamma'(k+1)}{\Gamma^2(k+1)}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.5}$$

Thus if $-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} \notin \mathbb{Z}_+$ then for $n > -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the following equality holds:

$$\Sigma_n = \frac{1}{\alpha} \Gamma\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right) x^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} + \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \zeta(-\alpha k - \gamma, a) x^k.\tag{4.6}$$

If $-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} = r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ then for $n > -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the relation

$$\Sigma_n = \operatorname{res}_{s=-r} F(s) + \sum_{k=0, k \neq r}^n \operatorname{res}_{s=-k} F(s),\tag{4.7}$$

is met, where the residues at the points $s = -k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $k \neq r$, are calculated as above. To calculate the residue of the function F at the point $s = -r$ one should take account of the following expansion of the function x^{-s} in a Taylor series in a neighborhood of the point $s = -r$:

$$x^{-s} = b_0 + b_1(s+r) + \dots, \quad b_0 = x^r, \quad b_1 = -x^r \ln x.$$

In view of relations (4.4) and (4.5) for $\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} = -r$ and $k = r$ respectively, we obtain the following expansion of the function F in a Laurent series in a neighborhood of the pole $s = -r$:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} F(s) &= \frac{B_{-2}}{(s+r)^2} + \frac{B_{-1}}{(s+r)} + B_0 + B_1(s+r) + \dots, \\ B_{-2} &= c_{-1} a_{-1} b_0 = \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{(-1)^r}{\Gamma(r+1)} x^r, \\ B_{-1} &= c_{-1} a_{-1} b_1 + c_{-1} a_0 b_0 + c_0 a_{-1} b_0. \end{aligned} \right\}\tag{4.8}$$

Therefore,

$$\operatorname{res}_{s=-r} F(s) = B_{-1} = \frac{(-1)^r x^r}{\Gamma(r+1)} \left(-\frac{\ln x}{\alpha} + \frac{\Gamma'(r+1)}{\Gamma(r+1)} \frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{\Gamma'(a)}{\Gamma(a)} \right).\tag{4.9}$$

Now let us find estimate for the integral I_n in (4.3). If $\sigma_n \neq -\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$ we have:

$$|I_n| \leq \frac{x^{\sigma_n}}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\Gamma(-\sigma_n + it)| |\zeta(-\alpha\sigma_n - \gamma + i\alpha t, a)| dt, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad x > 0.\tag{4.10}$$

The convergence of the integral in (4.10) is implied by both the relation

$$|\Gamma(-\sigma_n + it)| = \frac{\pi}{\operatorname{ch}(\pi t) |\Gamma(1 + \sigma_n - it)|}$$

and estimates (3.3) and (3.7) (in the case of $a > 1$ it should also be considered the relation (3.5)). Thus asymptotic expansions (1.7) and (1.8) are proved.

Case of $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ in Theorem 1.1

For fixed $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ we put:

$$n(\varepsilon, \gamma, \alpha) := \max \left\{ \frac{1-\gamma}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2}; \frac{|\gamma|}{\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{2}; 1 \right\}.$$

Then, for all positive integers $n \geq n(\varepsilon, \gamma, \alpha)$, the following inequalities hold:

$$\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma \geq 1; |\gamma| \leq \varepsilon\sigma_n \leq \varepsilon|\sigma_n - it|, t \in \mathbb{R}; \sigma_n > 1.$$

If $0 < a \leq 1$ then we conclude from (3.6) and (3.3) that, for all positive integers $n \geq n(\varepsilon, \gamma, \alpha)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, there hold inequalities (it should also be taken into account that $|\sin w| \leq e^{|\operatorname{Im} w|}$, $w \in \mathbb{C}$):

$$\begin{aligned} & |\zeta(-\alpha\sigma_n - \gamma + i\alpha t, a)| \leq \\ & \frac{2|\Gamma(1 + \alpha\sigma_n + \gamma - i\alpha t)|}{(2\pi)^{1+\alpha\sigma_n+\gamma}} e^{\frac{\pi}{2}\alpha|t|} \zeta(1 + \alpha\sigma_n + \gamma) \leq \\ & \frac{C(\gamma)}{(2\pi)^{\alpha\sigma_n}} e^{\frac{\pi}{2}\alpha|t|} |\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma - i\alpha t|^{\alpha\sigma_n+\gamma+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\alpha\sigma_n} e^{-\alpha|t| \operatorname{arctg} \frac{\alpha|t|}{\alpha\sigma_n+\gamma}} \leq \\ & \frac{C(\gamma)}{(2\pi)^{\alpha\sigma_n}} e^{\frac{\pi}{2}\alpha|t| - \alpha|t| \operatorname{arctg} \frac{\alpha|t|}{\alpha\sigma_n+\gamma}} e^{-\alpha\sigma_n} (\alpha + \varepsilon)^{\alpha\sigma_n+\gamma+\frac{1}{2}} |\sigma_n - it|^{\alpha\sigma_n+\gamma+\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C(\gamma) = \frac{2\zeta(2)e^{\frac{1}{8}-\gamma}}{(2\pi)^{\gamma+1/2}}$, and $\zeta(s) := \zeta(s, 1)$ stands for the Riemann zeta-function. Here we use the inequalities

$$\zeta(1 + \alpha\sigma_n + \gamma) \leq \zeta(2),$$

$$|\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma - i\alpha t| \leq \alpha|\sigma_n - it| + |\gamma| \leq (\alpha + \varepsilon)|\sigma_n - it|.$$

Since for all $n \geq n(\varepsilon, \gamma, \alpha)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ the inequality $|\sigma_n - it| \geq \sigma_n \geq 1$ is satisfied, we have for those n and t that

$$|\sigma_n - it|^\gamma \leq |\sigma_n - it|^{|\gamma|} \leq \sigma_n^{|\gamma|} \left(1 + \frac{|t|}{\sigma_n}\right)^{|\gamma|} \leq \sigma_n^{|\gamma|} (1 + |t|)^{|\gamma|}.$$

Finally, we obtain that for any $n \geq n(\varepsilon, \gamma, \alpha)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ there holds the inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} |\zeta(-\alpha\sigma_n - \gamma + i\alpha t, a)| &\leq \frac{C(\gamma)}{(2\pi)^{\alpha\sigma_n}} e^{\frac{\pi}{2}\alpha|t| - \alpha|t| \operatorname{arctg} \frac{\alpha|t|}{\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma}} e^{-\alpha\sigma_n} \times \\ &(\alpha + \varepsilon)^{\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma + \frac{1}{2}} |\sigma_n - it|^{\alpha\sigma_n + \frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^{|\gamma|} (1 + |t|)^{|\gamma|}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

The relation (3.3) implies the validity of the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma(-\sigma_n + it)| &= \frac{\pi}{\operatorname{ch}(\pi t) |\Gamma(1 + \sigma_n - it)|} \leq \\ &(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\pi|t|} |\sigma_n - it|^{-\sigma_n - \frac{1}{2}} e^{\sigma_n} e^{|t| \operatorname{arctg} \frac{|t|}{\sigma_n}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geq n(\varepsilon, \gamma, \alpha)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Both the relation (4.11) and the last inequality yield that, for any $n \geq n(\varepsilon, \gamma, \alpha)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < a \leq 1$, the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &|\zeta(-\alpha\sigma_n - \gamma + i\alpha t, a) \Gamma(-\sigma_n + it)| \leq \\ &\frac{C_1(\gamma)}{(2\pi)^{\alpha\sigma_n}} e^{\psi(t) + (1-\alpha)\sigma_n} (\alpha + \varepsilon)^{\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma + \frac{1}{2}} |\sigma_n - it|^{(\alpha-1)\sigma_n} \sigma_n^{|\gamma|} (1 + |t|)^{|\gamma|} \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

is fulfilled, where $C_1(\gamma) = (2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{1}{6}} C(\gamma)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(t) &= -\pi|t| + |t| \operatorname{arctg} \frac{|t|}{\sigma_n} + \frac{\pi}{2}\alpha|t| - \alpha|t| \operatorname{arctg} \frac{\alpha|t|}{\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma} = -\frac{\pi}{2}|t| - \\ &-(1-\alpha)|t| \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \operatorname{arctg} \frac{|t|}{\sigma_n} \right) + \alpha|t| \left(\operatorname{arctg} \frac{|t|}{\sigma_n} - \operatorname{arctg} \frac{\alpha|t|}{\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma} \right) \leq \\ &-\frac{\pi}{2}|t| + |\gamma|. \end{aligned}$$

Here we take account of $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and use the inequality

$$|\operatorname{arctg} v - \operatorname{arctg} u| = \left| \int_u^v \frac{dx}{x^2 + 1} \right| \leq \left| \int_u^v \frac{dx}{x^2} \right| = \left| \frac{1}{u} - \frac{1}{v} \right|, \quad u, v > 0.$$

Combining the inequality $|\sigma_n - it|^{(\alpha-1)\sigma_n} \leq \sigma_n^{(\alpha-1)\sigma_n}$ in (4.12) with the estimate for $\psi(t)$ yields the validity of the relation:

$$\begin{aligned} &|\zeta(-\alpha\sigma_n - \gamma + i\alpha t, a) \Gamma(-\sigma_n + it)| \leq \\ &\frac{C_1(\gamma) e^{|\gamma|}}{(2\pi)^{\alpha\sigma_n}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}|t|} e^{(1-\alpha)\sigma_n} (\alpha + \varepsilon)^{\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma + \frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^{(\alpha-1)\sigma_n} \sigma_n^{|\gamma|} (1 + |t|)^{|\gamma|} \end{aligned}$$

for every $n \geq n(\varepsilon, \gamma, \alpha)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < a \leq 1$. Applying this inequality to (4.10) we obtain the following estimate for I_n in (4.3) in the case of $n \geq n(\varepsilon, \gamma, \alpha)$:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} |I_n| &\leq \frac{x^{\sigma_n} e^{(1-\alpha)\sigma_n} (\alpha + \varepsilon)^{\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma + \frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^{(\alpha-1)\sigma_n + |\gamma|}}{(2\pi)^{\alpha\sigma_n + 1}} I(\gamma), \\ I(\gamma) &= C_1(\gamma) e^{|\gamma|} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}|t|} (1 + |t|)^{|\gamma|} dt. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (4.13)$$

If $0 < \alpha < 1$ then (4.13) implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_n = 0$ for any $x > 0$. If $\alpha = 1$ then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_n = 0$ for every $x \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{1+\varepsilon})$ and hence for every $x \in (0, 2\pi)$. Thus the second part of Theorem 1.1 is proved in the case $0 < a \leq 1$.

If $a > 1$ then $a = p + a_0$, where $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < a_0 \leq 1$, and we find:

$$|\zeta(-\alpha\sigma_n - \gamma + i\alpha t, a)| \leq |\zeta(-\alpha\sigma_n - \gamma + i\alpha t, a_0)| + a(a-1)^{\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma}$$

(see (3.5)). In this case the right-hand side of the inequality (4.13) contains one more summand:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{x^{\sigma_n}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\pi|t|} |\sigma_n - it|^{-\sigma_n - \frac{1}{2}} e^{\sigma_n + \frac{1}{6}} e^{|t| \arctg \frac{|t|}{\sigma_n}} a(a-1)^{\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma} dt \leq \\ &\frac{x^{\sigma_n}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sigma_n^{-\sigma_n - \frac{1}{2}} e^{\sigma_n + \frac{1}{6}} a(a-1)^{\alpha\sigma_n + \gamma} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}|t|} dt, \quad n \geq n(\varepsilon, \gamma, \alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Here we use the inequality $|\sigma_n - it|^{-\sigma_n - \frac{1}{2}} \leq \sigma_n^{-\sigma_n - \frac{1}{2}}$. The right-hand side of the inequality (4.14) tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $x > 0$. Theorem 1.1 is complete.

Proof of Theorem 1.2

The proof follows from both Theorem 1.1 and the obvious relation

$$\tilde{f}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) = f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) - 2^{\gamma+1} f\left(2^\alpha x, \frac{a+1}{2}, \gamma, \alpha\right), \quad x > 0.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.3

Take $\sigma = \beta \in \left(\max\left\{0, \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right\}, \mu\right)$ in (3.9), and replace x by $(k+a)^\alpha x$, $a > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\alpha > 0$, $x > 0$. Then summarize the obtained relations

$$\frac{(k+a)^\gamma}{(x(k+a)^\alpha + 1)^\mu} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\beta-i\infty}^{\beta+i\infty} \frac{\Gamma(\mu-s)\Gamma(s)}{\Gamma(\mu)} x^{-s} (k+a)^{-\alpha s + \gamma} ds$$

over all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. In the left-hand side, we obtain $g(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu)$. In the right-hand side, we interchange the sum and integral signs (this is well defined in view of (3.2), (3.3) and $\alpha\beta - \gamma > 1$). It follows that, for any $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$, $\mu > \max\left\{0, \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right\}$, $x > 0$ and $\max\left\{0, \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right\} < \beta < \mu$, the following relation holds:

$$g(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\beta-i\infty}^{\beta+i\infty} G(s) ds ,$$

where $G(s) = \frac{\Gamma(\mu-s)\Gamma(s)}{\Gamma(\mu)} x^{-s} \zeta(\alpha s - \gamma, a) = \frac{\Gamma(\mu-s)}{\Gamma(\mu)} F(s)$ and the function F from (4.1). Singular points of the functions G and F coincide on the half-plane $\operatorname{Re} s < \mu$. Consider $\sigma_n = n + \frac{1}{2}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, taking account of (3.4), (3.7) and the equality (3.5) (for $a > 1$), in the case of $\sigma_n \neq -\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$ we obtain the following relation:

$$g(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) = \Sigma_n + I_n, \quad I_n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\sigma_n-i\infty}^{-\sigma_n+i\infty} G(s) ds, \quad (4.15)$$

where Σ_n stands for the sum of residues of the function G at poles lying on the interval $(-\sigma_n, \beta)$. If $n > -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then the interval $(-\sigma_n, \beta)$ contains only the poles $s = -k$, $k = 0, \dots, n$, and $s = \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$. If $-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} \notin \mathbb{Z}_+$ then these poles are simple, and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{res}_{s=\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} G(s) &= \frac{\Gamma\left(\mu - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right)}{\Gamma(\mu)} \operatorname{res}_{s=\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} F(s) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\mu - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right)}{\Gamma(\mu) \alpha} x^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}}, \\ \operatorname{res}_{s=-k} G(s) &= \frac{\Gamma(\mu+k)}{\Gamma(\mu)} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \zeta(-\alpha k - \gamma, a) x^k, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \end{aligned}$$

For $-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha} = r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the residues at the points $s = -k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $k \neq r$, can be calculated as above. To calculate the residue of the function G at the point $s = -r$ it should be considered (4.8), (4.9) as well as the following expansion of the function $\frac{\Gamma(\mu-s)}{\Gamma(\mu)}$ in a Taylor series in a neighborhood of the point $s = -r$:

$$\frac{\Gamma(\mu-s)}{\Gamma(\mu)} = A_0 + A_1(s+r) + \dots, \quad A_0 = \frac{\Gamma(\mu+r)}{\Gamma(\mu)}, \quad A_1 = -\frac{\Gamma'(\mu+r)}{\Gamma(\mu)}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{res}_{s=-r} G(s) &= B_{-1}A_0 + B_{-2}A_1 = \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(\mu+r)(-1)^r x^r}{\Gamma(\mu)\Gamma(r+1)} \left(-\frac{\ln x}{\alpha} + \frac{\Gamma'(r+1)}{\alpha\Gamma(r+1)} - \frac{\Gamma'(a)}{\Gamma(a)} - \frac{\Gamma'(\mu+r)}{\alpha\Gamma(\mu+r)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us find estimate for the integral I_n in (4.15). If $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\sigma_n \neq -\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$ and $x > 0$, we have:

$$|I_n| \leq \frac{x^{\sigma_n}}{2\pi\Gamma(\mu)} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\Gamma(\mu+\sigma_n-it)| |\Gamma(-\sigma_n+it)| |\zeta(-\alpha\sigma_n-\gamma+i\alpha t, a)| dt. \quad (4.16)$$

The convergence of the integral in (4.16) is proved exactly in the same way as that for the integral in (4.10). Theorem 1.3 is complete.

Proof of Theorem 1.4

If $\mu > \max\left\{0, \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right\}$ then the proof is implied both by Theorem 1.3 and the relation

$$\tilde{g}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) = g(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) - 2^{\gamma+1} g\left(2^\alpha x, \frac{a+1}{2}, \gamma, \alpha, \mu\right), \quad x > 0.$$

If $\mu > \max\left\{0, \frac{\gamma}{\alpha}\right\}$, the proof is exactly the same as that of Theorem 1.3. It should be noted that in this case, for any $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$, $\mu > \max\left\{0, \frac{\gamma}{\alpha}\right\}$, $x > 0$ and $\max\left\{0, \frac{\gamma}{\alpha}\right\} < \beta < \mu$ the relation

$$\tilde{g}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\beta-i\infty}^{\beta+i\infty} \tilde{G}(s) ds$$

holds, where $\tilde{G}(s) = \frac{\Gamma(\mu-s)\Gamma(s)}{\Gamma(\mu)} x^{-s} \tilde{\zeta}(\alpha s - \gamma, a)$.

5 Proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha > 0$. Then there are no constants $p, \beta, c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that one of the identities $x^\beta e^{px} f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) \equiv c$ or $x^\beta e^{px} \tilde{f}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) \equiv c$ holds for $x > 0$.*

Proof. Assume that $x^\beta e^{px} f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) \equiv c$, $x > 0$. Then $c > 0$, and it follows from the asymptotics $f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) \sim a^\gamma e^{-a^\alpha x}$, $x \rightarrow +\infty$ that $p = a^\alpha$ (if $p > a^\alpha$ or $p < a^\alpha$ then $c = +\infty$ or $c = 0$ respectively, which is impossible). Hence $\beta = 0$ (if $\beta > 0$ or $\beta < 0$ then $c = +\infty$ or $c = 0$, which is impossible) and $c = a^\gamma$. Therefore $f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) \equiv a^\gamma e^{-a^\alpha x}$, $x > 0$ but $f(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) > a^\gamma e^{-a^\alpha x}$ for every $x > 0$.

Assume that $x^\beta e^{px} \tilde{f}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) \equiv c$, $x > 0$. It follows from the asymptotics $\tilde{f}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) \sim a^\gamma e^{-a^\alpha x}$, $x \rightarrow +\infty$ that $c > 0$. As above we obtain similarly that $\tilde{f}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) \equiv a^\gamma e^{-a^\alpha x}$, $x > 0$. Then $\tilde{f}(x, a+1, \gamma, \alpha) \equiv a^\gamma e^{-a^\alpha x} - \tilde{f}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha) \equiv 0$, $x > 0$ but $\tilde{f}(x, a+1, \gamma, \alpha) > 0$ for large $x > 0$. Lemma 5.1 is proved. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.1

In the case of $a > 0$, $\gamma + 1 > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, $\mu > \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$, $p \geq 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, define the following function of the variable $x > 0$:

$$\varphi(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu, c, p) := \frac{c}{(p+x)^{\mu-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}}} \cdot \frac{\Gamma\left(\mu - \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right)}{\Gamma(\mu)} - S(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu).$$

It is easy to check that for any $x > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ there hold the relations:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & (-1)^k \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \{\varphi(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu, c, p)\} = \\ & \frac{\Gamma(\mu+k)}{\Gamma(\mu)} \varphi(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu+k, c, p), \\ & \varphi(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu, c, p) = \\ & \frac{1}{\Gamma(\mu)} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-xt} t^{\mu-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}-1} \left(c e^{-pt} - t^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha) \right) dt. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (5.1)$$

The integral representation in (5.1) follows from both the inequalities $\mu > \frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}$, $p \geq 0$ and the asymptotics $f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha) \sim a^\gamma e^{-a^\alpha t}$, $t \rightarrow +\infty$ and $f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha) \sim \frac{1}{\alpha} \Gamma\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}\right) t^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}}$, $t \rightarrow +0$ (see Theorem 1.1). These asymptotics imply also that $A_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) < +\infty$ if and only if $p < a^\alpha$, and $B_q(a, \gamma, \alpha) > 0$ if and only if $q \geq a^\alpha$. We will need the following theorem in what follows (see [24, 25, 26]).

Theorem 5.1 (Bernstein–Hausdorff–Widder). *The following two conditions are equivalent:*

1. A function $f \in C^\infty(0, +\infty)$, and the inequality $(-1)^k f^{(k)}(x) \geq 0$ holds for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $x > 0$.
2. We have $f(x) = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-xt} d\mu(t)$, $x > 0$, where μ is a nonnegative Borel measure on $[0, +\infty)$ such that the integral converges for every $x > 0$. In this case the measure μ is finite on $[0, +\infty)$ if and only if $f(+0) < +\infty$.

Both the Bernstein–Hausdorff–Widder theorem and relations (5.1) yield that the validity of inequalities (2.7) for every $\mu > \mu_0$ and $x > 0$ is equivalent to that for the inequalities $Ae^{-pt} - t^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha) \geq 0$ and $Be^{-qt} - t^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha) \leq 0$ for any $t > 0$. The last ones are equivalent to the inequalities $A \geq A_p(a, \gamma, \alpha)$ and $B \leq B_q(a, \gamma, \alpha)$ respectively.

The relation (1.7) implies that $B_q(a, \gamma, \alpha) \leq \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha})}{\alpha} \leq A_p(a, \gamma, \alpha)$ for $0 \leq p < a^2 \leq q$. If $a \geq 1$ (see the inequality (2.5) and the text below it), we have $\frac{1}{2} \leq B_q(a, 1, 2)$, $A_p(a, 1, 2) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for $0 \leq p \leq m(\infty, a)$,

$q \geq a^2$, and hence $B_q(a, 1, 2) = A_p(a, 1, 2) = \frac{1}{2}$ for any $a \geq 1$ and for the same p and q ; in particular, this is satisfied for $p \in [0, a^2 - a]$ (since $a^2 - a < m(\infty, a)$).

Let $0 \leq p < a^\alpha$, $A \geq A_p(a, \gamma, \alpha)$, and let $q \geq a^\alpha$, $B \leq B_q(a, \gamma, \alpha)$. If either the right-hand side or the left-hand side inequality in (2.7) turns into an equality for some $x \geq 0$ (or for $x > 0$ if $p = 0$) then it follows from the integral representation (5.1) that either $A \equiv e^{pt} t^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha)$ or $B \equiv e^{qt} t^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\alpha}} f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha)$ for $t > 0$, which contradicts Lemma 5.1. Theorem 2.1 is complete.

Proof of Theorem 2.2

For $a > 0$, $\gamma + 1 < 0$, $\alpha > 0$, $\mu > 0$, $p \geq 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, define the function

$$\psi(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu, c, p) := \frac{c}{(p+x)^\mu} - S(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu), \quad x > 0.$$

It is easy to check that for any $x > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ there hold the inequalities:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} (-1)^k \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \{ \psi(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu, c, p) \} &= \frac{\Gamma(\mu+k)}{\Gamma(\mu)} \psi(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu+k, c, p), \\ \psi(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu, c, p) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\mu)} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-xt} t^{\mu-1} (c e^{-pt} - f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha)) dt. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (5.2)$$

The integral representation in (5.2) is implied by both the inequalities $\mu > 0$, $p \geq 0$, the asymptotics $f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha) \sim a^\gamma e^{-a^\alpha t}$, $t \rightarrow +\infty$ as well as by the equality $f(+0, a, \gamma, \alpha) = \zeta(-\gamma, a) > 0$ (see Theorem 1.1). These relations yield also that $D_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) < +\infty$ if and only if $p \leq a^\alpha$, and $E_q(a, \gamma, \alpha) > 0$ if and only if $q \geq a^\alpha$. If $p \leq a^\alpha$ then the function $e^{pt} f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha)$ strictly decreases with respect to $t > 0$. Therefore $D_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) = \zeta(-\gamma, a)$ for all $p \leq a^\alpha$ and $E_{a^\alpha}(a, \gamma, \alpha) = a^\gamma$.

Both the Bernstein–Hausdorff–Widder theorem and the relations (5.2) imply that the validity of inequalities (2.9) for every $\mu > \mu_0$ and $x > 0$ is equivalent to that for the inequalities $D e^{-pt} - f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha) \geq 0$ and $E e^{-qt} - f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha) \leq 0$ for any $t > 0$. The last ones are equivalent to the inequalities $D \geq D_p(a, \gamma, \alpha)$ and $E \leq E_q(a, \gamma, \alpha)$ respectively.

Let $0 \leq p \leq a^\alpha$, $D \geq D_p(a, \gamma, \alpha)$, and let $q \geq a^\alpha$, $E \leq E_q(a, \gamma, \alpha)$. If either the right-hand side or the left-hand side inequality in (2.9) turns into an equality for some $x \geq 0$ (or for $x > 0$ if $p = 0$), then the integral representation (5.2) yields that either $D \equiv e^{pt} f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha)$ or $E \equiv e^{qt} f(t, a, \gamma, \alpha)$ for $t > 0$, which is impossible (see Lemma 5.1). Theorem 2.2 is complete.

Proof of Theorem 2.3

For $a > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$, $\mu > \max\{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}; 0\}$, $p \geq 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ define the function

$$\tilde{\psi}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu, c, p) := \frac{c}{(p+x)^\mu} - \tilde{S}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu), \quad x > 0.$$

It is easy to check that for any $x > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ there hold the relations:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} (-1)^k \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \left\{ \tilde{\psi}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu, c, p) \right\} &= \frac{\Gamma(\mu+k)}{\Gamma(\mu)} \tilde{\psi}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu+k, c, p), \\ \tilde{\psi}(x, a, \gamma, \alpha, \mu, c, p) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\mu)} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-xt} t^{\mu-1} \left(c e^{-pt} - \tilde{f}(t, a, \gamma, \alpha) \right) dt. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (5.3)$$

The integral representation in (5.3) follows from both the inequalities $\mu > \max\{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}; 0\}$, $p \geq 0$, the asymptotics $\tilde{f}(t, a, \gamma, \alpha) \sim a^\gamma e^{-a^\alpha t}$, $t \rightarrow +\infty$ as well as from the equality $\tilde{f}(+0, a, \gamma, \alpha) = \zeta(-\gamma, a)$ (see Theorem 1.2). These relations yield also that $0 < C_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) < +\infty$ for $p \leq a^\alpha$ and that $C_p(a, \gamma, \alpha) = +\infty$ for $p > a^\alpha$, and that $F_q(a, \gamma, \alpha) > -\infty$ as well.

Both the Bernstein–Hausdorff–Widder theorem and the equalities (5.3) imply that the validity of inequalities (2.12) for any $\mu > \mu_0$ and $x > 0$ is equivalent to that for the inequalities $C e^{-pt} - \tilde{f}(t, a, \gamma, \alpha) \geq 0$ and $F e^{-qt} - \tilde{f}(t, a, \gamma, \alpha) \leq 0$ for any $t > 0$. The last ones are equivalent to the inequalities $C \geq C_p(a, \gamma, \alpha)$ and $F \leq F_q(a, \gamma, \alpha)$ respectively.

Let $0 \leq p \leq a^\alpha$, $C \geq C_p(a, \gamma, \alpha)$, and let $q \geq 0$, $F \leq F_q(a, \gamma, \alpha)$. If either the right-hand side or the left-hand side inequality in (2.12) becomes the equality for some $x \geq 0$ (or for $x > 0$ if $p = 0$ or $q = 0$) then the representation (5.3) implies that either $C \equiv e^{pt} \tilde{f}(t, a, \gamma, \alpha)$ or $F \equiv e^{qt} \tilde{f}(t, a, \gamma, \alpha)$ for $t > 0$, which is impossible due to Lemma 5.1. Theorem 2.3 is complete.

Acknowledgements. This work has been supported by the Foundation for Fundamental Research of Ukraine, Grant F25.1/055.

References

- [1] A. F. Timan, *A precise estimate of the remainder in the approximation of differentiable functions by Poisson integrals*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **74** (1), 17–20 (1950).
- [2] L. V. Malei, *Precise estimate for approximation of quasi-smooth functions by Poisson integrals*, Vesci Akad. Navuk BSSR Ser. Fiz.-Tehn. Navuk, No.3, 25–32 (1961).

- [3] É. L. Shtark, *The complete asymptotic expansion for the supremum of the deviation of functions in $Lip1$ from their Abel–Poisson singular integrals*, Mat. Zametki **13** (1), 21–28 (1973).
- [4] V. A. Baskakov, *Certain properties of operators of Abel–Poisson type*, Mat. Zametki **17** (2), 169–180 (1975).
- [5] K. M. Zhigallo and Yu. I. Kharkevich, *The complete asymptotics of the deviation from the class of differentiable functions of the set of their Poisson harmonic integrals*, Ukrain. Mat. Zh. **54** (1), 43–52 (2002) [Ukrainian Math. **54** (1), 51–63 (2002)].
- [6] V. P. Zastavnyj, *On series arising from the approximation of periodic differentiable functions by Poisson integrals*, Mat. Zametki **86** (4), 497–511 (2009).
- [7] A. O. Gel’fond, *Residues and Their Applications*, Nauka, Moscow, 1966.
- [8] V. P. Zastavnyj, *The generalized Euler–Maclaurin formula and its application*, Trudy Inst. Appl. Math. Mech. **17**, 51–60 (2008).
- [9] E. T. Whittaker, G. N. Watson, *A Course of Modern Analysis*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1927.
- [10] H. Bateman and A. Erdélyi, *Higher Transcendental Functions*, Vol. 1: *The Hypergeometric Function, Legendre Functions* (McGraw–Hill, New York–Toronto–London, 1953; Nauka, Moscow, 1965 and 1973 (2nd ed.))
- [11] E. A. Riekstyn’sh, *Estimates for Remainders in Asymptotic Expansions*, Zinatne, Riga, 1986.
- [12] E. Titchmarsh, *Introduction to the Theory of Fourier Integrals*, 3rd Ed., Chelsea, New York, 1986.
- [13] É. L. Mathieu, *Traité de Physique Mathématique. VI-VII: Théory de l’Élasticité des Corps Solides (Part 2)*, Paris, Gauthier-Villars, 1890.
- [14] L. Berg, *Über eine Abschätzung von Mathieu*, Math. Nachr., **7**, 257–259 (1952).
- [15] J. G. van der Corput, L. O. Heflinger, *On the inequality of Mathieu*, Indagationes Mathematicae, **18**, 15–20 (1956).

- [16] E. Makai, *On the inequality of Mathieu*, Publ. Math. Debrecen, **5**, 204–205 (1957).
- [17] A. Elbert, *Asymptotic expansion and continued fraction for Mathieu's series*, Period. Math. Hungar., **13**, 1–8 (1982).
- [18] H. Alzer, J. L. Brenner, O. G. Ruehr, *On Mathieu's inequality*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **218**, 607–610 (1998).
- [19] V. P. Zastavnyi, *Mathieu's series: inequalities, asymptotics and positive definiteness*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0901.1104v1> (2009).
- [20] P. H. Diananda, *Some Inequalities Related to an Inequality of Mathieu*, Math. Ann., **250**, 95–98 (1980).
- [21] A. Hoorfar, F. Qi, *Some new bounds for Mathieu's series*, Abstract and Applied Analysis, **2007**, article ID 94854, 10 pages (2007).
- [22] Ž. Tomovski, R. Hilfer, *Some bounds for alternating Mathieu type series*, Journal of Mathematical Inequalities, **2** (1), 17–26 (2008).
- [23] V. P. Zastavnyi, *On a paper of Ž. Tomovski and R. Hilfer*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0901.4766v1> (2009).
- [24] S. N. Bernstein, *Sur les fonctions absolument monotones*, Acta Math., **52** (1), 1–66 (1929).
- [25] F. Hausdorff, *Summationsmethoden und Momentfolgen. II*, Math. Zeitschrift, **9**, 280–299 (1921).
- [26] D. V. Widder, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for the representation of a function as a Laplace integral*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **33** (4), 851–892 (1931).

Translated from Russian by D. Lymanskyi

CONTACT INFORMATION

V.P. Zastavnyi
 Donetsk National University
 Universitetskaya str., 24
 Donetsk 83001 Ukraine
zastavn@rambler.ru